

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/943,677	08/31/2001	Cameron G. Cofer	24565A	2612
7	590 05/28/2004		EXAM	INER
JOHN A. MOLNAR, JR. PARKER-HANNIFIN CORPORATION			YAO, SAMCHUAN CUA	
6t035 PARKLAND BOULEVARD CLEVELAND, OH 44124-4141			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1733	

DATE MAILED: 05/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/943,677	COFER ET AL.					
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
•	Sam Chuan C. Yao	1733					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 06 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may <u>only</u> be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appe Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applice  i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	oly to a sation in				
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3_months from the mailing date of b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adv event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the status of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three movement of the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	isory Action, or (2) the date set forth in th an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. So I 36(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate extention or (	ee MPEP extension fee ension fee under (2) as set forth in				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:						
(a) $\square$ they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I	·						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	in better form for appeal by mat	erially reducing or s	implifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clain	ns.				
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).		•					
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request fo application in condition for allowance because: se			T place the				
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which wer	re newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-35</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.					
9. $\square$ Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	· /	_				
10. Other:	·	Sam Chuan C. Yao	)				
	·	Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1733					

Application/Control Number: 09/943,677

Art Unit: 1733

4

## Remarks

- 1. Examiner wishes to thank Counsel for pointing out the typographical error in numbered paragraph 4 of the last office action. As correctly pointed out by Counsel and as clearly indicated in numbered paragraph 4 on pages 5-7, claims 4-5, 21-24, and 27-28 should have been included in a list of claims as being obvious under 35 USC 103 over the art of record.
- 2. In light of Counsel's arguments the rejections set forth in numbered paragraphs 2 and 5 are withdrawn. However, all pending claims stands rejected for reasons set forth in numbered paragraph 4.
- 3. As for Counsel's argument regarding the Bonazza patent on page 3 full paragraph 3, Counsel would appear to be taking Examiner's office action out of context. The Bonazza patent is not used because it suggests the application of metal-coated carbon fibers enhances mechanical properties of a resultant fiber-reinforced article. Rather, the Bonazza patent is primarily applied to show that, one in the art would have been motivated in the art to use a metal-coated carbon fibers in the process taught by WO '551 in order to form composite strands having an EMI shielding characteristic, so that a molded EMI shielding fiber-reinforced article can be manufactured using the strands. As for Counsel's argument regarding the improvement of mechanical properties, this is a secondary benefit suggested by Bonazza. See example II of the Bonazza patent, for example. In that example, Bonazza teaches forming a "prepreg reinforced with a chopped mat containing metal coated carbon fibers." (col. 6 lines 65-67). Accordingly, it "provides a material with increased conductivity over normal carbon

Application/Control Number: 09/943,677

Art Unit: 1733

processability. The high conductivity of the prepreg makes it an ideal candidate for EMI shielding applications. In preparing this prepreg, nickel coated carbon fiber chopped mat ... was sandwiched between 2 sheets of 2 mil PPS film." (emphasis added); and then stamp or compression molded in a desired a composite article having good EMI shielding characteristics (col. 6 line 67 to col. 7 line 35). While it is true that, Bonazza teaches providing a support layer to an EMI shielding composite layer. It does not necessarily mean that, the use of metal coated carbon reduces mechanical properties of a resultant fiber-reinforced composite. Moreover, simply because Bonazza teaches using a support layer, it does not also necessarily suggest that a resultant EMI shielding composite layer taught by Bonazza has a poor mechanical property. Equally important, the presently recited claims uses an open transitional phrase "comprising", therefore, the claims do not preclude one from providing a support layer to a resultant fiber-reinforced composite formed by heat-molding the recited fiber-reinforced pellet.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sam Chuan C. Yao whose telephone number is (571) 272-1224. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday with second Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richard Crispino can be reached on (571) 272-1226. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 1733

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sam Chuan C. Yao Primary Examiner Art Unit 1733

Scy 04-26-04